

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of April 3, 2006 is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the Examiner attached several initialed Forms 1449 to the outstanding Office Action indicating that the Examiner considered the references submitted in most of the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) that the Applicant has submitted. However, the Examiner is requested to note that the Applicant submitted an IDS on February 23, 2004, although the Examiner did not attach an initialed Form 1449 from that IDS indicating that the references listed on that Form 1449 were considered by the Examiner. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide an initialed copy of the Form 1449 that was attached to the IDS filed February 23, 2004.

The specification has now been amended as indicated above to correct a clear editorial error. However, no new matter has been added by these amendments. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments to the specification.

The Examiner rejected elected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserted that some of the language of original independent claim 1 was vague because it did not clearly indicate how the surface of the carrier base is roughened, and because the phrase “superposing” was slightly unclear. In view of these rejections, independent claim 1 has now been amended to clarify the original language. In particular, the term “superposing” has been removed from the claim, and the original language has been modified so as to clarify the features of the claim and address the Examiner’s concerns. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s formal rejections under § 112 have been overcome.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by the Suzuki reference (USP 5,021,296). However, as indicated above, independent claim 1 has now been amended so as to clarify the present invention. In addition, new dependent claims 8-14 have been added so as to further distinguish the present invention from the prior art. In this regard, it is submitted that amended independent claim 1 and new claims 8-14 all read on the elected Invention 1 and Species

1A. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended and new claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

As explained in paragraph [0014] of the Specification, an important object of the present invention is to produce a wiring transfer sheet to be used for manufacturing a wiring board by transferring the wiring layer to an object (such as an insulating substrate) so as to create the wiring board. In other words, the wiring layer is not *permanently* attached to the carrier base, and instead is *separable* from the carrier base so that the wiring layer can be easily transferred to the object to thereby form the wiring board. In order to clarify this feature in the claims, independent claim 1 has now been amended to recite that the method comprises pressing a sheet of wiring material having a first rough surface against a surface of a carrier base so that the sheet of wiring material is *separably positioned* on the surface of the carrier base by the pressing. Consequently, the wiring layer formed of the sheet of wiring material can be easily transferred from the carrier base to an object so as to form the wiring board.

The Suzuki reference teaches a process of forming a circuit board, including forming a copper wiring layer 3 on a resin layer 2 impregnated with glass cloth. In this regard, the Examiner is construing the resin layer 2 as corresponding to the carrier base of the present invention. However, as noted above, the Suzuki reference teaches a method of forming a circuit board rather than a wiring transfer sheet. Thus, the application of the copper wiring layer 3 to the resin layer 2 is intended to be *permanent*. In order to achieve this result, it is desirable for the copper wiring layer 3 to adhere to the resin layer 2 as tightly as possible (see, for example, Table 1 and Abstract). Consequently, the Suzuki reference does not teach or even suggest pressing a sheet of wiring material against the surface of the carrier base such that the sheet of wiring material is *separably positioned* on the surface of the carrier base by the pressing as recited in amended independent claim 1. In fact, in view of the overall teaching in the Suzuki reference of improving the adhesiveness (i.e., peeling strength) of the copper wiring layer 3 to the resin layer 2, it is submitted that the Suzuki reference actually *teaches away* from the invention recited in amended independent claim 1. Consequently, it is submitted that the Suzuki reference does not anticipate or even render obvious the invention recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended

independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

As noted above, new dependent claims 8-14 have been added so as to recite subject matter that further distinguishes the present invention from the prior art. Therefore, in addition to the reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 1, it is submitted that new dependent claims 8-14 are further distinguishable from the prior art in view of the subject matter cited therein.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki HIGASHITANI

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/rlg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 30, 2006